

## REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to avoid the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. The amended claim also is submitted to emphasize patentable differences over the art of record. New Claims 18-23 are directed to certain application embodiments of the present invention as disclosed on page 3 of the specification. Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-23 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in view of the limitations "free from chemical binding agents". The wording is removed from Claim 1, which thus should moot that ground of rejection.

Claims 1-2, 4, and 6-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite due to certain wording in Claim 1. In response, the wording "special covering or treatment" is removed from the preamble of Claim 1. With respect to the phrase "on the side opposite the adhesive coating", the limitation "a pressure sensitive adhesive coating . . . textile support" is relocated in Claim 1 and identified as applied to a side of the tape-like textile support, so as to provide appropriate antecedent basis.

In Claim 1, the phrase "at a certain temperature" is changed to -- at a temperature of melting --, which avoids the rejection as vague and indefinite and also provides proper antecedent basis for the following limitations concerning different melting points of the first fiber material and the second fiber material. With removal of the wording "selectively melted fibers", the questioned temperature limitations of Claim 1 should now meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Lastly, certain functional limitation formerly located in the preamble of Claim 1 is revised and relocated to the final paragraph of the claim. The feature that the tape can be unwound easily without tearing the fibers from the tape-like support finds support in page 1, penultimate

paragraph, and page 3, sixth full paragraph, of the specification.

Claims 1-2, 4 and 6-17 stand rejected as unpatentable over *Riedel* (5,631,073), either individually or in view of *Knoke* (4,490,425). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

*Riedel*, neither alone nor combined with *Knoke*, fails to disclose a tape that can be wound on itself and unwound easily, ready for use, without use of release sheets for release coatings and without tearing out fibers. The Examiner contends that column 10, lines 46-53 of *Riedel* (“Preferably, the adhesive coated tapes of the present invention also utilize a releasable liner [on] the adhesive layer, or a release coating . . . on the non-adhesive side of the tape, to facilitate the winding of the tape into easy-to-use rolls”) does not regard those limitations as essential. The applicant disagrees and respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill would understand that attempting to make a *Riedel* tape *without* his “preferable” releasable liner or release coating would be doomed to failure, or, at best, would produce adhesive-coated tapes that could be unwound from the roll only with such great difficulty as to be unusable in any practical sense.

Claim 1 defines an adhesive tape including a tape-like support comprising first and second fiber materials. These two fiber materials have different melting points, the first being not less than 150 degrees C and lower than the defined temperature of melting, and the second material having a melting point higher than 200 degrees C and higher than the temperature of melting. This claimed arrangement, in combination with other limitations set forth in Claim 1, produces an adhesive tape that can be wound and unwound easily, without tearing the fibers from the tape-like support.

Neither *Riedel* nor *Knoke* mentions the melting or softening points of the fiber materials discussed in those references. More to the point, neither reference suggests or otherwise directs one of ordinary skill to the particular combination of melting points required in the combination of Claim 1.

The Examiner asserts, at page 5, lines 3-11 of the last Office action, that the applicant's claimed melting points of the fibers would either be inherent, or at the most obvious optimizations to one of ordinary skill, given the disclosure in *Riedel* particularly beginning at column 5, line 8. The applicant traverses this unsupported assertion. Column 5 of *Riedel* is a broad statement that "[A]ny type or types of binder fibers can be employed to form the fibrous web . . . as long as they are capable of melt-bonding to the tensilized non-fracturable staple fibers of the fibrous web without fracturing, or substantially weakening the tensilized non-fracturable staple fibers" (column 5, lines 33-38). In that same paragraph, *Riedel* states that the binder fibers can comprise "a wide variety of binder fiber configurations that are well known in the art, including, without limitation, totally meltable binder fibers, side-by-side binder fibers, bicomponent binder fibers, elliptical core-sheath binder fibers, concentric core-sheath binder fibers, or combinations thereof". *Riedel* gives further examples at column 5, line 50 through column 6, line 8.

What *Riedel* does not provide, is any teaching or direction pointing one of ordinary skill to the particular combination of different melting points required for the adhesive tape disclosed and claimed by the present inventor. Furthermore, *Riedel* was not concerned with the problem confronted by the applicant, namely, an adhesive tape that could be wound onto itself and unwound easily, without requiring release sheets or release coatings and without tearing the fibers from the tape-like support. A fair understanding of *Riedel*, as discussed above, would leave one of ordinary skill well aware that a releasable liner or release coating is essential to any practical embodiment of *Riedel's* adhesive tapes. Because the reference teaches away from an adhesive tape without using release sheets or release coatings, it is not accurate to assert that the specific melting-point limitations recited in Claim 1 would either be inherent or mere obvious optimizations of *Riedel's* disclosure. That ignores not only the problem encountered by this applicant but also the applicant's solution to that problem. Plainly put, *Riedel* fails to provide one of ordinary skill with the teaching or direction required by a sustainable rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.


Turning to the newly-added claims, independent Claims 18, 20 and 22 respectively

recite an adhesive cable winding tape with anti-noise properties, a general-purpose adhesive tape, and a masking adhesive tape. Support for those claims is found on page 3, lines 8-16 of the present specification. Claims 19, 21 and 23 respectively depend from the new independent claims and recite limitations of fiber thickness and fiber length found at page 3, lines 17 and 18.

New Claims 18-23 recite, in combination with other elements, a tape-like support consisting essentially of a non-woven fabric from first and second fiber materials consisting essentially of specified percentages of the recited fibers, and with a specified basis weight. Furthermore, the first and second fiber materials have different melting points respectively lower and higher than the temperature of melting, as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, the specific adhesive tapes defined by new Claims 18-23 are even further removed from what one of ordinary skill would find taught by *Riedel*, and so those claims define patentable subject matter over that reference.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance and the applicant solicits a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Roger T. Frost  
Reg. No.: 22,176

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
(404) 815-6500  
Docket: 44815/250299